1994

A difference in women's and men's academic prose

Judith Bernadette Hawkins

A DIFFERENCE IN WOMEN'S AND MEN'S ACADEMIC PROSE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

English Composition

---

by

Judith Bernardette Hawkins

June 1994

A DIFFERENCE IN WOMEN'S AND MEN'S ACADEMIC PROSE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

by

Judith Bernardette Hawkins

June 1994

Approved by:

[redacted]

Rong Chen, Chair, English

June 14 /94

Date

[redacted]

Loralee Mac Pike

[redacted]

Kevin Burne

ABSTRACT

A question posed by Elizabeth Flynn in the December 1990 issue of College Composition and Communication, "Do Men and Women Compose Differently?" spawned this analysis of forty randomly selected abstracts from master's theses and projects by twenty women and twenty men at California State University, San Bernardino. Flynn says that women do compose differently and justifies her statement as "humanistic inquiry": "Research can be empirical without being posivititistic." Consequently I wondered whether the question "Do women and men compose differently?" could be proven by empirical analysis?

After developing a methodology for analysis based on sex/gender studies in the recent findings in sociological, sociolinguistic, business and research communities--all of which indicate sex/gender differences in style and structures for their communities--I analyzed forty abstracts for the same features. The results indicate highly significant differences between the women and the men in my sample group: the women used connective structures significantly more often than did the men and the men used contrastive structures significantly more often than did the women. This study indicates that a significant stylistic difference between these women's and men's academic prose.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to all those who have contributed to my education during graduate studies, but special thanks go to several people who may not be aware of their influence on my work. Thanks to Bruce Golden, who consistantly moved questions from what is it to what does it do? Thanks to Peter Schroeder, whom I have heard indirectly permitted me to move into non-traditional forms of academic prose. Thanks to Jim Brown and Clark Mayo, whose keen attention to detail in story permeated much of my thinking during this analysis. Thanks to Kevin Burne, who asked strong questions and whose kind words have been both solace and buckler. Thanks to Loralee MacPike, whose deft comments helped me to focus. Thanks to Rong Chen, whose wit and perspective helped me to pull this thesis together. And finally, thanks to my daughter, Damaris Hawkins, whose support and good humor and daily doses of Douglas Adams kept me going.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: The Question

> Within a given context or a given writer there is a certain correspondence between the rhetorical, syntactical, grammatical patterns and the writer's way of looking at the world. And when there is a high degree of regularity in the use of these patterns we may guess that the pattern comes from, and therefore reveals something of, the writer's habitual way of seeing reality, and that the pattern is one of the ways in which a similar way of looking at the world is created for the reader. (Thale 286)

What would it do to our way of teaching writing if we were to acknowledge that women's and men's "habitual way of seeing reality" is reflected in the way they compose or write? What if women and men think differently and learn to interact differently and, accordingly write differently? How might that knowledge affect the way we teach writing?

In the December 1988 issue of College Composition and Communication, Elizabeth Flynn asks "Do males and females compose differently?" In her article, "Composing as a Woman," she operates from the position that women and men reflect social and psychological differences in their written expression. Her discussion includes ideas which surface in Nancy Chodorow's The Reproduction of Mothering, specifically the idea that "[f]eminine identification processes are relational, whereas masculine identification processes tend to deny relationship" (Flynn, "Composing" 426). Flynn cites as examples to support

her hypothesis four student essays, two by women and two by men, which reflect the patterns derived from Chodorow's work. Flynn claims that the two women's essays, Kim's and Kathy's, emphasize horizontal relationships and communion or interconnectedness while the two men's essays, Jim's and Joe's, "stress individuation rather than connection" (Flynn, "Composing" 429).

Flynn also discusses Carol Gilligan's book, In a Different Voice, which was influenced by Chodorow's work. While Gilligan's work discusses morality, an issue which I am not approaching in this paper, her schematic metaphors illustrate another voice speaking to apparent differences in women's and men's styles of thinking: "the web [which] suggests interconnectedness" speaks to women's method of relating; and the "ladder [which] suggests an achievement-orientation as well as individualistic and hierarchical thinking" speaks to men's method of relating (Flynn, "Composing" 426). Flynn regards Kathy's expression of "strong need for connection, for affiliation" as well as Kim's "strong need to feel part of a group" (429) to be distinctly different from Jim's "solitary flight" in which he "emerges the somewhat shaken hero of his adventure" by achieving "his goal in the face of adversity" (430) and Joe's narrative in which Flynn sees him fulfilling "his gender role identification, his

socialization into a male role and a male value system, that allows him to become an achiever" (431). Flynn concludes

> we ought not assume that males and females use language in identical ways or represent the world in a similar fashion. And if their writing strategies and patterns of representation do differ, then ignoring those differences almost certainly means a suppression of women's separate ways of thinking and writing. ("Composing" 431-432)

While Flynn does not claim to have isolated any "characteristic patterns of male and female student writing . . . [as she] would need a considerably larger and more representative sample to make such a claim hold" ("Composing" 431), she does believe that she had "little difficulty identifying essays that revealed patterns of difference among the twenty-four papers [she] had to choose from, and [she] could easily have selected others" (431).

Although Flynn considers this work to be research, she qualifies it as "humanistic inquiry" in which the "illustrative example is often sufficient evidence to support a claim. The example may be an informative one or a representative one, to use Kenneth Burke's terms" ("Staffroom" 86). She further states that her research is not to be considered "positivistic" and claims that "research can be empirical without being positivistic" (87). She cites Clifford Geertz, whose "Thick Description" is intended to "yield defensible interpretations as new

phenomena arise that need to be interpreted" and is not intended to be "predictive" as positivistic empirical research is (87). Flynn also discusses her feminist approach which she sees as "necessarily skeptical of claims of the value-neutrality of research methods, theories, and facts" because they "all too often mask androcentrism" (87). "Research which. . . reflects the concerns of one group, white males, to the exclusion of others, often women and people of color" (87) Flynn sees as inherently biased from its inception.

All of this raises the question for me: Can this hypothesis--that women and men writers compose differently--be proven or disproven using posivitistic empirical research? What would that type of research look like? Who else has spoken to the question of differences in expression between women and men? Has this question been asked before?

I found that this question of distinctions between women and men is not new. As I look back to texts in rhetoric studies, I hear women's voices asking and speaking to this same question. Perhaps women writers have suggested this idea of difference as long as they have been writing.

In the 15th century, in response to Bibulus Sempronius having "brashly and publicly lament[ed] that [Laura Cereta]

was said to possess as fine a mind as nature ever bestowed upon the most learned man" (495) (implying that other women did not possess such minds), Cereta delivers strong arguments to him as she aligns herself with her sisters in her paper "Letter to Bibulus Sempronius, Defense of the Liberal Instruction of Women." The implication by Bibulus is simple: women are usually different because they are of less distinction and have less ability in expression. The implication by Cereta is equally clear: women are equally gifted by nature, and if they appear less distinct, it is due to their choices, not their abilities. As she says, "The explanation is clear: women have been able by nature to be exceptional, but have chosen lesser goals" (497). According to Cereta, although women have not been seen as equally competent with men, women are.

In the early 19th century, Sarah Grimke, in her "Letters on the Equality of the Sexes and the Condition of Woman," responds to a letter by the General Association of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts. In response to their statements regarding "the dangers which at present seem to threaten the FEMALE CHARACTER with widespread and permanent injury" (685), (the dangers being that women might be perceived as spiritual equals with men before God both in position and responsibility) Grimke argues:

> the New Testament has been referred to, and I am willing to abide by its decisions, but must enter my protest against the false translation of some passages by the MEN [sic] who did that work, and against the perverted interpretation by the MEN [sic] who undertook to write commentaries thereon. I am inclined to think, when we are admitted to the honor of studying Greek and Hebrew, we shall produce some various readings of the Bible a little different from those we now have. (686)

Grimke differs with those in power in her day, differs with their mode of relating, thinking and expressing, and also differs with the translators and commentators of the Bible. According to Grimke, women would produce a different written text, both in content and in form, and that women's translation would reflect women's point of view.

In the mid to late 20th century, due largely to the feminist movement, many studies were begun on gender and language. French feminists, continuing in this same line of thinking, contend that women not only have something different to say, but also have a different language in which to say it; women have a different way of viewing life and will reflect that difference as they develop their own forms in language to reveal their own point of view. The French feminists purport that men have determined the forms language has take. Therefore languages reflect the voices of the men. Helene Cixous maintains

> unequivocally that there is such a thing as marked writing; that, until now, far more extensively and repressively than is ever suspected or admitted, writing has been run by a libidinal and cultural--hence political, typically masculine--economy; that this is a locus where the repression of women has been perpetuated . . . ; that this locus has grossly exaggerated all the signs of sexual opposition. . .where woman has never her turn to speak, this being all the more serious and unpardonable in that writing is precisely the very possibility of change, the space that can serve. . .[as] a transformation of social and cultural structures. (1235)

Cixous argues that women need their own language, a language which reflects women and their perspective on life. By developing a feminine language with a system of references in language which illuminate women's perspective, both culture and society will experience positive changes.

Adrienne Rich, in her essay "Taking Women Students Seriously," states that women think differently than men do. To Rich, women's thinking is equated with critical thinking: women's thinking challenges the givens, the assumptions we usually operate under; women's thinking makes connections between facts and ideas; women's thinking remembers that "in every mind resides a body;" and women's thinking remains accountable to that "body" as she compares hypotheses against her experience (175-176). Rich characterizes women's thinking and expression of those thoughts as finding "the silences" (175), the unspoken truths with which women live. She says it is by naming

ourselves, as Paulo Freire calls us to do, that we speak out and write that which is hidden, that we "take women seriously" (176), that women develop their own voices and styles of composing. Therefore, Rich concludes along with Cixous that because women think differently than men and are often silenced because of those differences that women will demonstrate differences and learn to use them constructively as they learn to write themselves into existence and give voices to their silences.

These and many other women have spoken out of their experiences, and their voices echo the same message through the ages: women have something to say; women speak from a different perspectives; and women want to express their perspectives on life from their own points of view. When we listen to the voices of these women, not as isolated and unique cries in the night, but as a harmony of echoes growing louder and stronger, then the messages from women become clear and resonate within us. Many women, both past and present, believe they possess their own messages and their own voices. The question now is whether it can it be proven? Namely, are there any significant empirically demonstrable differences between the way men and women think and write?

CHAPTER TWO: The Context

Often times the forces silencing women's voices are buried in deep layers, hidden layers of assumptions. Because the assumptions of those in power determine the public course language takes (Bakhtin 930), the visible markers in language must be examined to detect the assumptions beneath the expressions. According to Smith,

> without awareness of assumptions, we remain mechanical members of our society, dangerously oblivious to the abstractions that govern us and without the ability to question them or to seek alternative new assumptions. The first requisite of intelligent freedom is to discover the assumptions that restrict our thinking and writing. (242)

In order to understand these assumptions, we must consider the possible ways language may be marked. First, it may be that men make all the choices and their assumptions totally govern language use. Although some may think that this is true because patriarchy has been so pervasive and exclusive, it has not totally encompassed all women or women would never have had any voice. And not all men have been or are patriarchial. So although at times in history women have come close to being fully silenced and even today many suffer in silence, some have managed to speak out for women rights and perspectives throughout the centuries even in patriarchy's strongest moments.

Second, it may be that women make all the choices and their assumptions totally govern language use. Women have never made all the choices in language use, in fact not even most, and at best perhaps women have made a few choices and assumptions which govern language use because women are not the dominant factor in society.

Third, it may be that neither women nor men make choices with regard to assumptions about language use, that power in language use is a neutral quality which either may appropriate and use. This theory may appear plausible but when women are able to appropriate power positions and powerful behavior, most often they have been derogated.

Fourth, it may be that men and women both make choices and assumptions about language use and they are equally valued. Although this is a worthy goal for both men and women, no evidence anywhere suggests that it is true. We are not currently at a point of awareness in our society where this is possible.

Fifth, it may be that women and men both make assumptions and choices about language use but they are unequally valued. Women's choices for the most part are not valued by society as highly as are men's. Men's choices and assumptions currently dominate much of life for most societies because it is assumed by those in power

that women either do not make significant or powerful choices or assumptions about language use or do not see life differently from men or their choices are of lesser value.

Many women believe that women's and men's assumptions and choices should be valued equally but acknowledge that they are not. With that in mind, many women have spoken out or are speaking out of their silences to challenge the assumptions of those in power. Women like Laura Cereta have questioned the patriarchial power structure they face and its point of view which has limited the boundaries of women's lives and experiences. Women like Sarah Grimke have questioned the patriarachial assumptions they face which say that different means lesser quality, that women, because they possess obvious differences from men and are judged in relation to men, are of lesser distinction and ability. Although today this view may not be widely held among educated people, its residual effects still impact women as they work to express themselves from their own points of view. Grimke says that women's perspective will surface, if given the opportunity. If these differences do come to the surface of language use, it should be possible to find them.

While many believe that there is no difference between women and men writers, that each uses the same language

in relatively the same way, this study contends, along with Cereta, Grimke, Cixous and others, that women may have their own way of seeing reality. Women's and men's ways of seeing reality and language use may differ and those different perspectives and choices should be valued equally.

The problem is how to find those differences specifically in academic prose. I began by looking at differences in language use which were already well established, and from there I sought to discover if differences existed in arenas of language use apart from university level writing before moving onto the analysis of university level academic prose.

If there are unisolated, demonstrable differences in language use, and if they cross over into academic prose, there may be common denominators between women's perspective on life and their writing style and men's perspecitive on life and their writing style. These women and men may also differ from each other in their perspectives and writing styles. And while there are evidently factors which further group women and men into other subgroups such as age, class, ethnicity and culture, patterns and strategies of language use of women and men--seen as sex/gender differences--may override the age, class, ethnicity and cultural differences. Further

study should be conducted which includes these factors if significant differences are found between women's and men's writing styles.

Sex/gender differences in language use, which have already been identified, can be seen in "marked language" such as Helene Cixous speaks of when she discusses language which privileges those in power. This marked language shows one way women have been subordinated and reveals sexual bias against women.

One example of a residual effect of this "marked language" is seen in a simple question raised by Robin Lakoff in a 1974 article for MS. magazine and is expanded upon in Language and Women's Place. As part of her public stance in the linguistic search for gender differences in language use, Lakoff identifies two language structures --markers--which have been used to subordinate women.

Lakoff names two areas causing derogation of women: women's use of precise and discriminating terms in naming and describing and the use of euphemisms in the naming of women by male speakers. First, Lakoff contends that "[w]ords like mauve, beige, ecru, aquamarine, lavender and the like, are unremarkable in a woman's active vocabulary, but largely absent from that of most men" (311). Although this propensity toward specificity in language, the naming of an item as mauve instead of pink

or red, indicates a high intellectual ability to make subtle distinctions, it is seen by patriarchial society as frivolous and is remarked on pejoratively. Second, a woman may be called lady which "confer[s] an exalted stature" but also implies "helpless[ness]" and "does not contain the sexual implications present in woman" (314). A woman can also be called a "girl" which stresses "immaturity" and "irresponsibility" while also "removing the sexual connotations lurking in woman" (315). Thus, Lakoff concludes in the first instance that female speakers use different modes of naming the world that are often described as frivolous. When those in power use this same technique of specific naming, they are said to be distinct and discriminating and subtle. In the second instance, Lakoff concludes that women are named differently and in diminutive modes. This divorces sexuality from women while permitting and encouraging it in men. Thus it causes women to be seen in polite and childlike forms, neither of which convey ability, power or wisdom, and it robs women of a portion of their humanity. Again, those in power have controlled both the language used and those using the language.

If these differences are analyzed in light of Norman Fairclough's theory of social power structure, it reveals that controlling occurs in three ways. First, in content

(what is said): certain kinds of specificities of men are valued, while those of women are not. This reveals an inequal valuation of a performative linguistic ability which disadvantages women because they are women. Therefore women, not men, are named linguistically in diminutive modes, revealing an unequal valuation based on sex/gender alone. Second, in relations (when people enter into social relations in discourse, the meaning of statements is most often determined by the speakers in power): women's speech is judged in relation to men's and found wanting because it is women's speech, and, accordingly denigrated. Third, in subjugation (the positions people are permitted to occupy in discourse): both in naming and in being named, women are put into positions of lesser power (Fairclough 46). Fairclough's theories illuminates Lakoff's findings by examining and explaining how the power structures in society work to achieve the distinctions she has isolated. Patriarchy, which is the dominant system, achieves and maintains its power by explicitly or implicitly subordinating other groups, the largest of which is women.

Another example of how this dominance has been maintained in language is sexual bias in favor of the male default. This sexual bias is aptly discussed by Alleen Pace Nilsen. In her article "Sexism in English:

A Feminist View," she concludes that the male form is not the default for both sexes. And such bias has been and is being confronted in most public arenas, most predominantly in the publishing, education and business communities. Thus, these surface reflections of marked language are being changed and the question of sexual bias in language use is no longer strongly contested. No reasonable argument exists today over the inappropriateness of the male default: the use of "he" when implying "he" and "she"; the use of "man" and "mankind" for "humans," "people" and "humankind" as indicators of both genders.

The male model should no longer function as the dominant means to express or explain human society. The dissolution of the male default continues throughout society, most notably in places where the male default has been used as a research standard: using the male model as norm, as opposed to a value-neutral norm or a norm which sets criteria based on the informants' subcultures' norms, skews results in that it does not reflect men as members of society as a whole but as representative of the whole society, and it does not reflect women at all. Deborah Cameron and Jennifer Coates, listing points needing to be considered when conducting research in the future, indicate that

> traditional sociolinguistic methods and measuring instruments have frequently been designed for male speakers and may not be maximally well adapted for female informants. Care needs to be taken to select informants of both sexes and to investigate all-female as well as all-male groups; to design non-linguistic criteria such as social class, network strength, etc. in ways that are applicable to both sexes; and to avoid definitions of important concepts that mean women are automatically excluded. (11)

Along with the dissolution of the male default, its extension in the pro-male-bias in research also needs to be dissolved.

Researchers, in a effort to clarify the assumptions we have operated under with regard to sex/gender issues, call for specificity and intertextuality, which add to the complexity of the question. For example, Penelope Brown in 1976 concluded that "explanations of language usage should come from a theory of social forces and a consideration of social status, race, and individual goals" (Thorne 234). In 1980, Virginia A. Eman and Benjamin W. Morse raised the issue of "Gender schema theory" when looking at child rearing and gender differences in language and "argue against using 'dichotomous biological classification' in research, suggesting that one's psychological orientation towards one's sex allows better understanding of such variables as. . .language" (Thorne 234). Also in 1980, Patricia C. Nichols argued that researchers should consider contextual matters such as

gender roles, types of education and activities of participants in their "speech communities" as part of the interpretive process when looking at gender differences in speech. In 1982, Noreen Carrocci proposed the use of "communication theory" as a field for context of interpretation of gender differences found.

Today, the question is not so much if there are sex/gender differences, but where do they exist. In phonemes and morphemes, researchers such as Mulcaster, Jesperson, Sapir, Trudgill, Labov, Cheshire, and Milroy have worked on differences for decades. In intonation, Sally McConnell-Ginet's research clearly indicates differences exist. In children's gendered use of language, Jacqueline Sachs has completed studies which reveal differences. Regarding the effect of behavior caused by use of gender markings, Norma Shepelak shows relationships between cause and effect. Sex/gender differences are discussed with regard to the moral implications by Carol Gilligan and Katha Pollitt; to female style in science by Nancy DiTomaso, Mary Frank Fox, and Marcia Barinaga (384-391); to gender style in the corporate world by Judy Rosener, F. Schwartz, Marilyn Loden, and B.M. Vetter; and to the speakers' social and interpersonal aspects of communication by Deborah Tannen. And these are but a few of the many voices speaking out on sex/gender

differences.

Today researchers in linguistics, sociolinguistics, psychology, business, and science agree differences exist; today their research focuses on the context in which these differences occur, on who has observed the differences, on what factors the observers bring to their observations, on what demographical factors may complicate the observations, on what significance can be found in the differences, and finally, on how are we to act in response to the knowledge gained. Today, Cixous' "marked" language is being documented. The questions for us now are: what do the markers look like? Can they be used to identify patterns in women's and men's academic prose?

In Jacqueline Sachs' study, "Preschool Boys' and Girls' Language Use in Pretend Play," she asks if boys and girls speak differently in pretend play situations. She concludes that while there were some similarities, boys and girls speak differently in pretend play situations in several ways:

> 1. Boys used the simple Imperative form much more frequently than did the girls. . .In fact, only one girl used more than one Imperative during the sixteen-minute interaction.
> 2. The boys used Prohibitions five times as frequently as did the girls.
> 4. Taken together, the Imperative, Prohibition, and Declarative Directives are directive forms showing no mitigation. . .the boys' Obliges were unmitigated (42% as compared with 17% for the girls). . . .

7. The girls made heavy use of tag questions [35 to the boys' 16.]
8. Joint utterances are mitigated because they imply cooperation between the listener and hearer. Fifteen percent of the girls' Obliges were Joint, five times as many as were spoken by the boys, and they talked about joint activities and roles, . . .
10. The only mitigating category in which we find more utterances by boys than girls is State [direct] Questions. Boys more often asked [directly] what the other wanted or how he felt, . . .
11. Looking overall at categories with mitigation, we find that many more of the girls' utterances were mitigated (65% as compared with 34% for the boys). (182-184)

While it is highly unlikely that imperatives or tag questions might be found in student compositions, we might find signs of the assertiveness, mitigation and joining activities Sachs finds in children's speech. It can also be concluded that even at an early age, girls and boys make choices and enact assumptions about language use.

Jennifer Coates, in Women, Men and Language, discusses "the social consequences of linguistic sex differences" in "miscommunication between women and men" (151). In discussing studies of women's interactions in all-women groups, and men's interactions with all-men groups, Coates indicates that

> women often discuss one topic for half an hour or more; they share a great deal of information about themselves and talk about their feelings and their relationships. Men on the other hand jump from one topic to another, vying to tell anecdotes which cent[er] around themes of superiority and aggression. They rarely talk about themselves, but compete to prove themselves

> better informed about current affairs, travel, sport, etc. (151-152)

Women here appear to parallel Chorodow's "feminine identification processes" (Flynn, Composing 176) by directing conversation to share personal information, thus making horizontal connections, as opposed to the men's anecdotes which centered on superiority and aggression. Here the men's behavior parallels Chodorow's idea of individuation while the women's behavior parallels her idea of feminine connection. There is also a parallel with Gilligan. Men's talk, like their moral reasoning, was hierarchial and moved toward abstraction and separation, while women's talk balanced self and other and placed relationality at the center of the activity.

While it is unlikely that written student work will be conversational, structures which reveal connection in women writers and which reveal separation in men writers would indicate stylistic differences. These stylistic differences are also evident in Coates' discussion "links between speaker turns" and "topic shifts" (152-153). She comments that research indicates that women, when in conversation, will make connections with the previous speaker while men "do not feel they have to make a link. . ." and "are more likely to ignore what was. . .said before and concentrate on making their own point" (152). "Elaboration and continuity," which are paralleling

activities, "are key notions in any analysis of women's talk," whereas "shifts between topics tend to be abrupt in all-male conversations" (153). "Women tend to organi[z]e their talk co-operatively," Coates continues, "while men tend to organi[z]e their talk competitively" (154). Coates' deductions suggest to me that if women use connective structures and men use contrastive structures, stylistic differences in writing would parallel stylistic differences in speech.

Judy Rosener, in the November-December 1990 issue of Harvard Business Review, also parallels the findings above as she discusses women's and men's managerial styles. Although Rosener found that both men and women in the survey experienced "work-family conflicts" (120) and that members of this study did not reflect the more common wage-gapped groups often surveyed, she did find clear differences in their management styles. "The men are more likely than the women to describe themselves in ways that characterize what some management experts call 'transactional' leadership" (120). Men, as "command-and-control" leaders, used "linear logic" in a "hierarchial system" (153). These men saw themselves in a superior or hierarchial position to their "subordinates" while women, as "interactive leaders," used "consensus building" and saw themselves as

interrelated with those working with them (153). Rosener's research reveals clear distinctions which indicate women's ways of leading and thinking, expressing information and interacting with others in the world differ from men's. Thus, identifying writing styles which reflect women's tendencies toward interrelational activities in business--making connections--and identifying writing styles which reflect men's tendencies toward hierarchial or status-oriented activities in business--making distinctions--would further prove a difference in writing styles.

Marcia Barinaga, writing for Science in April of 1993, asks "Is There a 'Female Style' in Science?" While she acknowledges exceptions (as I found in all other research), she believes that there is a difference, even though many women are reticent to admit it. This is because, as Caitilyn Allen, says, "'Women are afraid that if they discuss the possibility that they are doing science differently, it will be assumed that the science they are doing is not as good'" (384). Although some female scientists may see differences in style, they are hesitant to publicly voice their thoughts (Barinaga 384).

Barinaga also cites a small study done by Henry Etzkowitz and student Carol Kemelgor which

> investigated lab management styles of faculty in a medical school microbiology department. "We

> found there were two styles by which the investigators were running their labs," says Etzkowitz. Male faculty members were more likely to have students "competing with each other for the professors' attention," he says, while students in women's labs generally felt less competitive pressure. (385)

Additionally she says that Etzkowitz found that "many female faculty members feel additional responsibility for giving students extra encouragement and support" (385-386). Thus another component of women's style in management is to offer support, help and encouragement to those who work with them. Indications of this tendency to support and encourage along with a hesitancy to reveal difference, if found, would further develop the parallel between women's management styles and writing styles; and indications of separation or competition, if found, would further develop the parallel between men's management styles and men's writing styles. In each of the studies, regardless of the field in which they were conducted, consistent gender differences have appeared.

Thus, in each of these fields, sex/gender differences can be documented. Coates, while speaking within the socio-linguistic community, discusses the significance of these types of differences in order to contextualize the theories and philosophies within the events of the last several decades. She proposes two general theories: the dominance approach, which "sees women as an oppressed

group and interprets linguistic differences in women's and men's speech in terms of men's dominance and women's subordination;" and, the difference approach, which "emphasi[z]es the idea that women and men belong to different subcultures" in which "women claim they 'have a different voice, a different psychology, and a different experience of love, work and family from men'" (13).

Evidence so far suggests that neither polarity --neither all dominance theory nor all difference theory--may in itself be fully accurate. Women and women's language use have been derogated, as Lakoff, Nilsen and hundreds of others have shown. Yet, some women also believe that they have different ways of thinking, that their approach, purpose in language use, and speech differ from men's, that their styles of relating in management situations differs from men's, so that women may indeed be a separate subculture as Coates suggests. But perhaps our best understanding will be found in the overlapping of Coates' two theories, which would be similar to the fifth option discussed earlier in this chapter--women and men both make assumptions and choices about language use but women's are not valued to the degree that men's are. Consequently, although some women have been subjugated and derogated, and therefore some women's language use may be different due to that subjugation

and derogation, it is also that those differences may be due to women's personal choices in language use.

At the same time, in the struggle between personal choice and expectations, lines of distinction can get blurred for women. If indeed women are a subculture with distinct methods for expressing their values which differ from those of men's, then the subjugation of women's culture to the power or status culture may in some cases obliterate, in some cases overwhelm or overshadow, and in some cases taint women's knowledge and awareness of their first culture. Women may be blind to their first culture. The desire for approval, acceptance, and accomplishment may motivate women, knowingly or unknowingly, to accede to the expectations, styles, methods, and culture of those in power, thus making women appear not to have assimilated but to have always been a part of the power group's culture.

But language use reveals perspectives and assumptions about life. If language is also marked by women and their language use specifically reveals their ways of seeing reality just as men's language use reveals their own ways of seeing reality, then sex/gender differences may be determined by women when they express their own ways of seeing reality in their speech, interaction, and writing. So if these distinctions appear, and if they are an

accurate reflection of women's way of seeing reality, then the problem is not that women speak and write differently but that women's expressions in society are not highly valued.

Because argumentation--discourse which draws a conclusion by proving differences between positions or by separating and contrasting positions--has generally been the preferred and the valued form of discourse since the time of the Sophists, Plato and Aristotle, it has been the expected and preferred form of academic discourse for men and women. While argumentation may suit the purposes of men speakers and writers as these studies indicate that boys and men tend to choose to define by contrast, separation and status-oriented structures, it may not suit women's purposes. If women reveal their perspectives on life and ways of seeing reality in their language choices and if those choices in writing are the same as those revealed in these studies on girls' speech, women's talk, and women's management styles, then women's style of academic prose may not be the same as men's. Women's style may develop connections and synthesize. Synthesis--discourse which combines varied elements into a complex and unified whole--may reflect women's ways of viewing the world. Because the studies referred to in this chapter indicate a consistent pattern of

difference, then analysis of women's and men's academic prose should also reveal the same type of differences.

CHAPTER THREE: The Analysis

In order to approach the question of difference in women's and men's academic prose, I chose to analyze forty abstracts from master's theses and projects at California State University, San Bernardino. The abstracts selected were written between 1987 and 1993. They reflect several schools within the university, most prominently English Composition and Education.

These abstracts provide a uniform set of research materials for several reasons. First, all the writers had the same purpose: to provide synopses of their theses. Second, the abstracts were required to be of similar length: one to three pages. Third, the abstracts reflect accomplished writers in similar programs of study at the graduate level who have received all the writing instruction they are required to receive. Fourth, the abstracts are readily available in the university library for the purpose of further research.

The abstracts were randomly selected. The first twenty abstracts--ten by women writers and ten by men writers--were the first available on the library shelves in the English department. The next twenty--ten women writers and ten men writers--were selected for me by a librarian, as they are kept in a special reserve section of the library.

Once the abstracts were selected and sorted, but before I began counting for particular features, I found it necessary to establish a quantitative base line: word, sentence and paragraph counts to indicate whether like entities were being compared. By working with material of reasonably equal quality and quantity, I believe that the results of the analysis will be more likely to show relative significance. The women writers' abstracts were labeled F1 to F20, (female writer 1 through female writer 20,) and the men writers were labeled M1 to M20, (male writer 1 through male writer 20) as shown in all tables. I used the NCSS, a statistics software, to determine the presence or absence of statistical significance.

The word count for women writers is 4,148 words with a low of 131 and a high of 356 as shown in TABLE 1: WORD COUNTS. The mean for women writers (F1-F20) is 207.4. The word count for men writers (M1-M20) is 4,272 words with a low of 111 and a high of 356 as shown in TABLE 1: WORD COUNTS. The mean for men writers is 213.6. The word frequency distribution between the women and men writers, as shown in TABLE 2: WORD FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION, is not significant. Although there is some variance in the first category of individual writers' word use, 110-125 words, as the women writers did not write any abstracts

less than 125 words, this is not significant because the sum of the adjacent categories is nearly equal such that 5 women writers and 5 men writers wrote abstracts between 110 and 150 words; and 5 women and 5 men writers wrote abstracts between 150 and 200 words. Although 6 women and 4 men writers wrote abstracts between 200 and 250 words, this is not a significant difference; neither are the differences between 250 and 300 words--2 women writers, 3 men writers; nor are the differences between 300 and 375 words significant with 2 women writers and 3 men writers.

TABLE 1: WORD COUNTS

F1	174	M1	191
F2	245	M2	135
F3	206	M3	192
F4	167	M4	122
F5	212	M5	169
F6	356	M6	200
F7	170	M7	225
F8	183	M8	242
F9	241	M9	181
F10	152	M10	189
F11	265	M11	123
F12	245	M12	356
F13	150	M13	327
F14	202	M14	130
F15	131	M15	277
F16	145	M16	259
F17	125	M17	111
F18	136	M18	344
F19	347	M19	210
F20	296	M20	289
4,148		4,272	

TABLE 2: WORD FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

	110-125	125-150	150-175	175-200	200-225
Females	0	5	4	1	3
Males	3	2	1	4	2

225-250	250-275	275-300	300-325	325-350	350-375
3	1	1	0	1	1
2	1	2	0	2	1

The results of the word count, as shown in TABLE 3: WORD COUNT STATISTICS, indicate that the difference between women writers and men writers is not significant: the T-Value is .2719989 and the Probability is 0.7870 at the 0.05 confidence level. These women writers and the men writers produced a relatively equal number of words.

TABLE 3: WORD COUNT STATISTICS

	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Females	4,148	207.4	.2719989	0.7870
Males	4,272	213.6		

N=20 for both groups.

Thus, there is no significant difference in the number of words written by women and men writers and no significant difference in the length of the abstracts in this sample.

Also there is no significant difference in the number of sentences in this sample. In fact, the similarity of the total number of sentences is remarkable. Twenty women writers produced 181 sentences total in their abstracts with a low of 4 sentences and a high of 17 as shown in TABLE 4: SENTENCE COUNTS. The mean for women

writers is 9.05 sentences. Twenty men writers produced 183 sentences in their abstracts with a low of 4 and a high of 18 as shown on TABLE 4: SENTENCE COUNTS. The mean for men writers is 9.15 sentences.

TABLE 4: SENTENCE COUNTS			
F1	9	M1	6
F2	12	M2	7
F3	4	M3	9
F4	5	M4	5
F5	8	M5	5
F6	9	M6	5
F7	6	M7	8
F8	7	M8	15
F9	9	M9	4
F10	6	M10	5
F11	12	M11	6
F12	17	M12	18
F13	9	M13	17
F14	10	M14	7
F15	9	M15	13
F16	6	M16	12
F17	8	M17	5
F18	6	M18	12
F19	17	M19	10
F20	12	M20	14
	181		183

TABLE 5: SENTENCE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION							
	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19+
Females	0	6	8	4	0	2	0
Males	0	8	4	3	3	2	0

The range of differences in the sentence frequency distribution between women and men writers is also not significant as shown on TABLE 5: SENTENCE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION, although almost one-half of the men writers, 8 out of 20, wrote between 4-6 sentences in their abstracts, compared with about one-third of the women

writers who wrote 4-6 sentences in their abstracts. Almost one-half of the women writers, 8 out of 20, wrote in the 7-9 sentence category. Although all writers wrote between 4-18 sentences with the natural midpoint occurring at the 11 sentence level, the mid point for the men writers is just a bit lower than for the women writers.

TABLE 6: SENTENCE COUNT STATISTICS

	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Females	181	9.05	7.882992E-02	0.9376
Males	183	9.15		

N=20 for both groups.

The difference between the number of sentences by women writers and men writers is not significant, as shown on TABLE 6: SENTENCE COUNT STATISTICS. The T-Value is 7.882992E-02 and the Probability is 0.9376 at the 0.05 confidence level. There is no significant difference between women and men writers' number of sentences.

Women writers produced 68 paragraphs with a low of 1 and a high of 7 paragraphs as shown in TABLE 7: PARAGRAPH COUNTS. The mean is 3.45 paragraphs. Men writers produced 56 paragraphs with a low of 1 and a high of 5 paragraphs as shown in TABLE 7: PARAGRAPH COUNTS. The mean is 2.9 paragraphs.

TABLE 8: PARAGRAPH FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION reveals some differences, although the differences are not significant. Most men writers, 11 out of 20, wrote between

3 and 4 paragraphs while women writers were slightly more varied in the number of paragraphs they wrote.

TABLE 7: PARAGRAPH COUNTS			
F1	3	M1	4
F2	4	M2	3
F3	3	M3	1
F4	4	M4	2
F5	1	M5	2
F6	5	M6	3
F7	3	M7	2
F8	2	M8	3
F9	3	M9	2
F10	3	M10	3
F11	5	M11	3
F12	6	M12	5
F13	2	M13	5
F14	5	M14	2
F15	2	M15	3
F16	2	M16	3
F17	1	M17	1
F18	1	M18	4
F19	6	M19	3
F20	7	M20	4
	68		56

TABLE 8: PARAGRAPH FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION					
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
Females	7	7	5	1	0
Males	7	11	2	0	0

The difference between women writers' and men writers' number of paragraphs is not significantly different as shown in TABLE 9: PARAGRAPH COUNT STATISTICS. The T-Value is 1.138073 and the Probability is 0.2633 at a 0.05 confidence level.

TABLE 9: PARAGRAPH COUNT STATISTICS				
	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Females	68	3.45	1.138073	0.2633
Males	56	2.9		

N=20 for both groups.

No significant differences exist between women writers and men writers in either number of words, sentences or paragraphs. Women writers and men writers, who are thought to have relatively the same access to language and have completed their B.A.'s and M.A.'s produced abstracts of close-to-equal length and proportion as reflected in the statistical analysis of the base line features of their abstracts.

In Chapter Two, sex/gender differences appeared in each of the fields of study: sociolinguistics, sociology, management and scientific research communities. Consistently women tended to use supportive and inclusive and connective strategies. Consistently men tended to use strategies which developed distinctions in status, in contrast or separation by exclusion or negation. So I analyzed these abstracts for language structures which would reveal writers making choices to connect or choices to separate.

Jerome Thale, when analyzing an historian for his style and voice, said, "Within a given context or a given writer there is a certain correspondence between the rhetorical, syntactical, grammatical patterns and the

writer's way of looking at the world" (286). Thale makes the connection between the way we look at life, the patterns we see life organized into, the ways we see people or things interacting and our way of organizing language, of using language to express our view of reality. Further, Thale says that when "there is a high degree of regularity in the use of these patterns we may guess that the pattern comes from, and therefore reveals something of, the writer's habitual way of seeing reality" (286.) We are what we say, or rather we say the way we see. Thale concludes that pattern of reality through which we speak and write "is one of the ways in which a similar way of looking at the world is created for the reader" (286). Not only do we express ourselves in distinct patterns, but when we do so with some regularity, we say something about ourselves, and we also recreate our pattern of seeing the world within the minds of our readers.

With this in mind, I began looking for rhetorical, syntactical and grammatical patterns or markers in the abstracts. Markers which indicate support, inclusion, connection and addition I called "Connective." Along with these, markers which reveal distinction by status or hierarchy, separation, and negation I called "Contrastive." I found that these patterns respectively

set a tone within each abstract which controlled the overall pattern of the abstract.

What follows is a listing of the choices of connective and contrastive terms and strategies made by each writer, and thereafter an analysis of them.

TABLE 10: WOMEN WRITERS' MARKERS

F1 Connectives: integral part of-1, also-1, (and)-3, provide-1, help-2, and-11, App-4, interaction-1, support-1. Total=25.
Contrastives: Total=0.
Purpose: to propose that we can incorporate whole self into writing process, both conscious and subconscious.
Connective.

F2 Connectives: App-1, encourages-2, (and)-5, and-8, interconnectedness-1, also-1, help-2. Total=20.
Contrastives: rather than-3, isolate-1, takes away-1, not-1, distinguish from-1, while-1, only-1. Total=9.
Purpose: to propose idea of familiar essay of personal exploration in which the writer makes connections and interprets the world through personal point of view.
Connective.

F3 Connectives: mutually-1, and-7, (and)-8, interact-1, include-2, also-2, combined-1, integrate-1,as part of-1, help-1. Total=25.
Contrastive: outstanding-1, transcends-1. Total=2.
Purpose: poetry must incorporate certain rhetorical elements.
Connective.

F4 Connectives: and-6, (and)-12, App-5, provide-1, bridge between-1, both-1. Total=26.
Contrastives: to break-1, raises-1. Total=2.
Purpose: to support idea of connecting innovations with the writing process.
Connective.

F5 Connectives: and-12, (and)-2, App-3, engage-2,

also-1,both-1, help-1. Total=22.
Contrastives: but-3, not-3, while-1. Total=7.
Purpose: to contrast student writers' methods with those of professional writers with the purpose of connecting students with professional writers' revision techniques.

Connective and contrastive.

F6 Connectives: and-14, (and)-7, App-1, within-1, support-1, enable-1, as well as-1, facilitate-1. Total=27.
Contrastives: only-1, otherwise-1, neither-1, nor-2, but-1. Total=6.
Purpose: to connect craftsmanship and creativity as elements of invention.

Connective.

F7 Connectives: and-5, (and)-10, App-3, provide-1, also-1, include-3, help-1, support-1. Total=25.
Contrastives: while-1. Total=1.
Purpose: to propose that elements of Stevenson's writing, when added together, identify him as a Scot.

Connective

F8 Connectives: and-3, (and)-3, also-1. Total=7.
Contrastives: shorter than-1, difference between-1, not-1, but-1, only-1. Total=5.
Purpose: to reveal the differences between two versions of Cather's novel.

Contrastive.

F9 Connectives: and-6, (and)-3, App-5, comprises-1, also-1, incorporate-1, support-2, encourage-1, connection-1. Total=21.
Contrastives: less than-1, down played-2, denial-4, cut off from-1. Total=8.
Purpose: to support the idea that we need to integrate feelings and ideas in the writing process.

Connective.

F10 Connectives: and-4, (and)-4, as well as-1, facilitate-1, include-1. Total=11.
Contrastives: no-1. Total=1.
Purpose: to show that after new program tried, students in sample had positive feelings about computer use, and working with

students will help them to improve.
Connective.

F11 Connectives: and-16, (and)-5, include-3, relate-2,incorporate-1. Total=27.
Contrastives: failure-1, neglect-1. Total=2.
Purpose: to show that students can improve math skills through journaling and supportive teaching techniques.
Connective.

F12 Connectives: and-6, (and)-9, App-1, also-2, additionally-1, enable-1, as well as-1, help-1, provide-1. Total=23.
Contrastives: none-1=1.
Purpose: an assessment model was developed to help universities to be more responsive to minority students.
Connective.

F13 Connectives: and-2, also-1. Total=3.
Contrastives: differences-4, not-2. Total=6.
Purpose: to identify the differences in levels of emphasis on career awareness in middle school settings.
Contrastive.

F14 Connectives: and-5, (and)-15, provide-1, assemble-1, also-1, summed together-2. Total=25.
Contrastives: but-1, not-2, no-1, lack-1, different-1. Total=6.
Purpose: to connect survey with resultant in-services.
Connective.

F15 Connectives: and-4, (and)-13, accompany-1, include-3, also-2. Total=23.
Contrastives: Total=0.
Purpose: to connect 2nd-4th grade students with information on water project.
Connective.

F16 Connectives: and-1, interpersonal-3, incorporate-2, consisting of-1, provide-1. Total=8.
Contrastives: but-1, not-1. Total=2.
Purpose: to connect hospital based management program with adult education theory.
Connective.

F17 Connectives: and-2, additionally-1, enable-1, an integral part of-1. Total=5.
Contrastives: however-1, only-1, too-1. Total=3.
Purpose: to support adding additional teachers to enhance students' writing skills.
Connective.

F18 Connectives: and-2, supplement to-1, enhance-1, relationship-1, between the two-1. Total=6.
Contrastives: no-1, difference-1, greater-1. Total=3.
Purpose: to examine and then connect computers with the teaching of geometry.
Connective.

F19 Connectives: and-13, (and)-5, integrate-1, participants in-5, component of-1, strengthen-1, match between-1, include-2, integral part of-1, support-3, bridge-1, provide-1, incorporate-1, encouraged-1, align-1, facilitate-2, engage-1. Total=41.
Contrastives: however-2, fragment-1, rather than-1, regardless-1. Total=5.
Purpose: to develop a connection between home-based and school-based learning to support emergent preschool writers.
Connective.

F20 Connectives: and-19, (and)-5, together-1, facilitate-2, co-learner-1, involve-1, both-1, immerse-1, provide-3, enable-1, connection-1, within-2, integral part of-1, interrelated-1, integrate-1, both-1. Total=42.
Contrastives: failure-1. Total=1.
Purpose: to make connections between teachers and students in order to immerse students in literature.
Connective.

TABLE 11: MEN WRITERS' MARKERS

M1 Connectives: and-5, (and)-4, support-2, conform-1, relate-1, equally-1. Total=14.

Contrastives: excerpts-3, certain-1, other-1, however-1, to be questioned-1, questionable-2, on the other hand-1, but-2, less than-1, not-1. Total=14.
Purpose: to contrast Orwell's writing guidelines with his writing to reveal the inconsistancies.

Contrastive.

M2 Connectives: and-3, (and)-2, in tandem with-1, interplay-1, connect-1. Total=8.
Contrastives: used apart from-1. Total=1.
Purpose: to reveal connections between spatial rhetoric and verbal rhetoric.

Connective.

M3 Connectives: and-8, (and)-2, relate-2, App-1=13.
Contrastives: preferred-1, comparison with-1, argue-1, renders out-1, not-1, slights-1, contrary-1, instead of-1. Total=8.
Purpose: to contrast Fish's and Bacon's methods and to show differences between them.

Contrastive.

M4 Connectives: and-5, (and)-1, also-1. Total=7.
Contrastives: conflict-1, negative-1, preferred-1, lack of-1, different-1, mistaken for-1, rated weaker-1. Total=7.
Purpose: to reveal differences between Japanese ESL students' strategies and English teacher's expectations and how ESL students may be rated lower in status accordingly.

Contrastive.

M5 Connectives: and-12, (and)-2, App-1, relation/ship-3. Total=18.
Contrastives: that though-1, unique sets-1. Total=2.
Purpose: to reveal that although speech and writing are related, they are essentially two different sets of codes.

Contrastive.

M6 Connectives: and-5, (and)-1, App-1, both-1, additionally-1. Total=9.
Contrastives: juxtapose-1, against-1, secondary-1, certain-1, uniqueness-1, critical-1, not-1, only-1, but-1. Total=9.
Purpose: to contrast one writer's work against others to reveal certain poetic qualities.

Contrastive.

M7 Connectives: and-5, (and)-13, App-1, help-1, relate-1. Total=21.
Contrastives: inadequate-1, not-1, different-1, regardless-1, primarily-1, placed under-1. Total=6.
Purpose: to reveal how high school teachers are inadequately trained, to help then make connections with material in the study and to define "content" as an item of primary importance in the study.

Contrastive (with a connective element).

M8 Connectives: and-10, (and)-2, App-2, enlist-1. Total=15.
Contrastives: certain-1, stand out-1, greatest-1, few-1, superficial to-1, however-1. Total=6.
Purpose: to identify Churchill's oratory style as extraordinary and unique.

Contrastive.

M9 Connectives: and-6, (and)-4. Total=10.
Contrastives: failure-2, however-1, not-1, rather-1, argue-2, conflicts-2, differ/ent-3, certain-2. Total=14.
Purpose: to reveal differences in strategies between high school and university teachers.

Contrastive.

M10 Connectives: and-7, (and)-11, App-1, both-1, include-1, help-1, facilitate-1. Total=23.
Contrastives: however-1, not-1, counterpoint to-1, supra-3, beyond-1, limitations-1, overly-1, certain-1. Total=10.
Purpose: to help student with superior skills via certain types of assignments.

Contrastive and connective.

M11 Connectives: and-3, (and)-2, combined-1, consist of-1, interface-1, infuse into-1. Total=9.
Contrastives: Total=0.
Purpose: to make connections between computer technology and social science/history.

Connective.

M12 Connectives: and-11, (and)-4, interpersonal-2, relations-3, also-2, incorporate-1,

support/ive-2. Total=25.
Contrastives: certain-1, problematic-1, abandon-1, without-2, only-1, deprived-1, barriers-1, unless-1. Total=10.
Purpose: to identify problems and barriers to an advisor/advisee program.

Contrastive.

M13 Connectives: and-7, App-1, in addition-1, include-1, as well as-1, encourage-1, work together-1, cooperative-1, help-1, both-2. Total=17.
Contrastives: only-1, not-1, but-1, little-1, not-1, lack-1, although-1, however-1, better than-1, divided-1, alternative-2, most important-1. Total=13.
Purpose: to encourage students to see alternatives to war in a cooperative learning group.

Connective and contrastive.

M14 Connectives: and-2, also-1, include-1, contain-1. Total=5.
Contrastives: not-2, too-1. Total=3.
Purpose: to identify wildlife material that is not local or usable and contrast it with material which is local and more usable.

Contrastive.

M15 Connectives: and-8, (and)-2, include-2. Total=12.
Contrastives: problem-1, although-1, differences-2, however-1, only-1, which-2, even greater-1, best-1. Total=10.
Purpose: to reveal differences with existing physical education program and the superiority of the proposed program.

Contrastive.

M16 Connectives: and-7, (and)-6, as part of-1, enable-1, include-1. Total=16.
Contrastives: no-2, relative worth-1, while-2, only-1, differences-1, best-2, which-2. Total=11.
Purpose: to reveal differences between existing physical education program and the proposed one.

Contrastive.

M17 Connectives: and-1, (and)-2, App-1, related-1,

include-1, cooperative-1, agreement-1 Total=7.
Contrastives: increased-1, advantage-1. Total=2.
Purpose: to show the advantages of community college instruction through cooperative agreements.
Connective.

M18 Connectives: and-10, (and)-3, incorporate-1, encourage-1, support-1, App-3. Total=19.
Contrastives: polarization of-1, more than-1, few have-1, dissimilar-1, primarily-1, while-2, not-2, certain-1, differences-1, segment-1, which-3. Total=15.
Purpose: to identify differences and polarities such that voters will vote correctly and not in a confused manner.
Contrastive.

M19 Connectives: and-4, (and)-2, provide-1, as well as-1, incorporate-1, bridge-1, engage-1. Total=11.
Contrastives: disregard-1, instead-1 outside-1 different-1, regardless-1, rather than-1. Total=6.
Purpose: to support whole language learaning by contrasting it to traditional methods.
Contrastive.

M20 Connectives: and-9, (and)-2, provide-1, assist-1, contain-2, equal-1. Total=16.
Contrastives: primary-1, however-1. Total=2.
Purpose: to provide a handbook on a year round school calendar for school administrators.
Connective.

Each writer's use of connective and contrastive patterns is listed in TABLE 10 and TABLE 11. These are condensed into TABLE 12, provided below.

The writers' main purposes defined within these abstracts reveal tendencies in each group. Of the women, 17 made connections their overall pattern, 2 made contrasts

their overall pattern and 1 made both connection and contrast her pattern. Of the men, 15 made contrasts their overall pattern, 4 made connections their overall pattern, and 1 made both connection and contrast his overall pattern.

TABLE 12: CONNECTIVE AND CONTRASTIVE TOTALS

Connectives				Contrastives			
F1	25	M1	14	F1	0	M1	14
F2	20	M2	8	F2	9	M2	1
F3	25	M3	13	F3	2	M3	8
F4	26	M4	7	F4	2	M4	7
F5	22	M5	18	F5	7	M5	2
F6	27	M6	9	F6	6	M6	9
F7	25	M7	21	F7	1	M7	6
F8	7	M8	15	F8	5	M8	6
F9	21	M9	10	F9	8	M9	14
F10	11	M10	23	F10	1	M10	10
F11	27	M11	9	F11	2	M11	0
F12	23	M12	25	F12	1	M12	10
F13	3	M13	17	F13	6	M13	13
F14	25	M14	5	F14	6	M14	3
F15	23	M15	12	F15	0	M15	10
F16	8	M16	16	F16	2	M16	11
F17	5	M17	7	F17	3	M17	2
F18	6	M18	19	F18	3	M18	15
F19	41	M19	11	F19	5	M19	6
F20	42	M20	16	F20	1	M20	2
	412		275		70		149

The women used 412 connective terms and the men used 275 connective terms and structures. The mean for the women, as shown in TABLE 13: CONNECTIVE STATISTICS, is 20.6. The mean for the men, as also shown, is 13.75. The T-Value is 2.487104 and the Probability is 0.0189 at the 0.05 confidence level. These women used significantly more connectives structures than did the men.

TABLE 13: CONNECTIVE STATISTICS				
	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Female	412	20.6	2.487104	0.0189
Male	275	13.75		

N=20 for both groups.

Women also show greater diversity in their individual number of choices of connective terms or strategies. In TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF CONNECTIVE TERMS, I compared the choices only women made to the choices both women and men made and to those made only by men. I looked at three connective categories as suggested by the research studies examined in Chapter 2: terms of support; terms of inclusion/ connection; and terms of addition.

TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF CONNECTIVE MARKERS		
Women	Both	Men
Terms of support		
enhance	enable	assist
strengthen	encourage	
	facilitate	
	help	
	provide	
	support	
Terms of Inclusion/Connection		
accompany	as part of	conform
align	both	contain
between the two	bridge	cooperative
co-learner	combine	enlist
component	consist	incorporate
comprises	engage	infuse into
connection	include	in tandem
immerse	interpersonal	interface
integral part	incorporate	interplay
integrate	interpersonal	connect
interact	relate	
interaction	relationship	
interconnected	together	
interrelated		

involve
match between
mutually
participants in
summed together
supplement to
within
assemble

Terms of Addition

	additionally	agreement
	also	equal/equally
	and/(and)	in addition to
	(appositives)	
	as well as	

The women and men both chose many of the same terms of support: "enable," "encourage," "facilitate," "help," "provide" and "support." One man also used "assist" and two women also used "enhance" and "strengthen" once each. While no significant difference exists between the types of words chosen by these writers, it is significant that women chose to use terms of support three times more often than did the men: 42 to 14 times.

In terms of inclusion and connection, a greater difference of choices appears. Both women and men chose several of the same terms, 12 terms, as shown in TABLE 14: COMPARISON OF CONNECTIVE MARKERS in the "both" column. While men chose only 10 different terms of inclusion beyond the ones both groups chose, women chose 22 different terms of inclusion and connection beyond the terms that both groups chose more than twice as many as the men. When

looking at the actual number of terms used, we find that women again used almost twice as many terms of inclusion and connection as did men: 72 to 42.

In terms of addition, women did not make any choices in addition to the ones that both women and men made, while three men chose to use 3 more terms of addition, beyond those chosen by both groups. But 3 choices out of the men's 219 choices is not significant. Again women chose to use terms of addition significantly more often than did men: 298 to 219.

In all of these categories, women chose to use terms of support, inclusion and addition significantly more often than did men. Women's behavior as writers appears to parallel women's behavior as speakers, managers and researchers: They tend to make connections.

In TABLE 12: CONNECTIVE AND CONTRASTIVE TOTALS, although women used significantly more connectives overall than did men, the men used significantly more contrastive terms or structures than did women: 149 to 70. The mean for women, as shown in TABLE 15: CONTRASTIVE STATISTICS, is 3.5 compared to 7.45 for the men. The difference is significant: The T-Value is 3.236681 and the Probability is 0.0028 at the 0.05 confidence level.

TABLE 15: CONTRASTIVE STATISTICS				
	Total	Mean	T-Value	Probability
Female	70	3.5	3.236681	0.0028
Male	149	7.45		

N=20 for both groups.

When analyzing for contrastive terms, I again turned to the studies examined in Chapter Two which revealed that the men in the studies exhibited hierarchial or status-oriented behavior and speech, as well as behavior which separates and negates. Thus I organized the analysis of the contrastive terms into three sections: terms of distinction, hierarchy and status; terms of separation; and terms of negation.

Men and women only made five overlapping choices in terms of distinction, hierarchy and status, as shown in TABLE 16, "greater," "rather than," "while," "less than" and "too." The women chose six terms that the men did not choose, but the men chose 22 different terms that women did not choose to use, nearly four times as many different choices as the women's choices. The men also used terms of distinction, hierarchy and status almost three times as often as did women: 50 to 17.

The men's range of choices of terms of separation is even more dramatic. While both men and women chose to use only 3 of the same terms, "difference/different," "however," and "while," and women only selected 7 different

choices, the men chose to use 34 different terms of separation, almost 5 times as many as the women. Equally dramatic is the men's number of uses of terms of separation compared to women's, 74 to 15, again almost five times as many as the women.

The women used terms of negation more often than did the men: 35 to 25. While they made three more different choices of these terms than did men only, these numbers are not high enough to be significant.

TABLE 16: COMPARISON OF CONTRASTIVE MARKERS

Women	Both	Men
Terms of Distinction, Hierarchy and Status		
outstanding	greater	better than
raises	rather than	best
transcends	while	beyond
down play	less than	certain
shorter than	too	increased
neglect		more than
		most important
		overly
		preferred
		primarily/primary
		stand out
		supra-
		which
		few
		inadequate to
		lack of
		limitations
		little
		placed under
		rated weaker
		secondary
		superficial to
Terms of Separation		
break	difference	abandon
cut off from	however	against
distinguish from	while	although

otherwise		certain
takes away		counterpoint to
neglect		disregard
fragment		advantage
		alternative
		argue
		comparison with
		contrary to
		deprive
		disregard
		dissimilar
		divided
		excerpts
		instead
		juxtapose
		mistaken for
		other
		on the other hand
		outside
		polarization of
		problem/atic
		question/able
		relative worth
		renders out
		segment
		slights
		that though
		unique
		unless
		used apart from
		without

Terms of Negation		
denial	but	negative
neither	failure	
none	lack	
nor	only	
	no	
	not	

Thus, while men did not use more terms of negation, they did use a significantly greater number of terms of distinction, hierarchy and status and terms of separation than did the women.

The patterns of use of these connective and contrastive terms and structures by women and men are just as revealing of difference as are the numbers. Women used connective structure to join simple elements, such as a series of nouns or verbs or adjectives, to join a series of complex ideas, and to synthesize a series of ideas. Women often used connective structures in series such as paragraph three of F3's abstract. (The connective structures are underlined and the contrastive are in **bold.**)

> The outcome of this thesis is the realization that for poetry to "work" it must have effective rhetoric, (and) it must bring to the surface of the text processes such as parallelism, (and) additions, (and) suppressions and substitutions--(appositive) all the transformations of the symbol which help to bring languages into existence and particularly poetry into existence (Hobson iii).

F3 has used connective structures to develop a series of ideas which become interrelated and synthesized to speak to the nature of language and to its poetry. This stylistic feature and F3's regular use of it reflect her way of looking at the world and her way of organizing the components in it: it reveals her way of thinking and writing as one of making connections.

This same use of intensive connectives to synthesize information is seen in F4's abstract, paragraph 2:

> New Journalism, (appositive) a technique developed by a few innovative American nonfiction writers (appositive) (Wolfe, (and) Mailer, (and) Capote, (and) Didion) during the postmodern period and designed to break the hundred-year-old British

> pattern of rigid expository writing, **raises** journalism from objective reporting to the realm of art by using post modern fictional devices in nonfictional prose (Kollitz iii).

F4's uses connectives densely to synthesize a half dozen complex ideas as she reveals her way of looking at the world by means of this connective stylistic technique. She builds one relationship to another: New Journalism to authors to periods to technique to genres.

This same type of pattern is seen in F7's second paragraph as she connects ideas--genre to authors to specific linguistic elements--to reveal relationship. This is her way of seeing and arranging reality, and it in turn becomes a reality for her readers.

> The genre of Scottish writers, having been firmly established by such writers as Norman Wilson, (and) Robert Watson, (and) Kurt Wittig, (and) Roderick Watson, (and) Edwin Muir, (and) Karl Miller, (and) Tom Narin, and Roderick Watson [sic], is identified by linguistic elements which help support the established element of theme. Specifically, these linguistic elements include the use of contrast and counterpoint, (and) juxtaposition and antithesis, (and) paradox and parallelism (Dunsmore iii).

"Women's way of thinking makes connections between facts an ideas" and "compares hypothesis against experience" (Rich 175-176). Women writers even use contrastive structures to enhance their connections. For example, in the opening paragraph of F2's abstract on the familiar (or personal) essay, she uses contrastive

structures to support her idea of the student's need to make connections and in doing so also supports Rich's idea that women writers compare hypotheses, the status-quo givens, to their own experiences.

> The familiar essay is an informal, open work of non-fiction prose. This kind of essay encourages exploring, (and) testing and playing with ideas **rather than** proving a thesis. Familiar writers give us a sense of ourselves and our interconnectedness with the rest of our world at a time when our obsession with the high speed transmission of information works **to isolate us from** one another by minimizing the importance of curiosity, (and) contemplation, (and) interrogation, (and) conversation and discussion. This obsession also takes away some of our freedom because it requires that we accept other's answers **rather than** discovering our own. The familiar essay can help students learn to find their own answers (Butler iii).

F2's purpose is to promote opportunities for inter-connectedness. She uses the contrastive structure **rather than** to elevate her idea that students should be permitted to learn by making their own connections with the world by exploring, by comparing their experiences to the ideas they find in their studies. In her second paragraph, she says, "the familiar essay offers an intimate audience, open forum and friendly tone. . . . "[T]hese qualities **distinguish** this essay form **from** the informational and scientific essay" (Butler iii). F2 uses three contrastive structures in order to blend a discussion of style, "familiar essay," with purpose, "exploring life's questions."

M10's essay, however, uses connective structures to support his contrastive ideas. In his first paragraph he too finds it necessary to "challenge the givens, the assumptions that we operate under" (Rich 175-176).

> There are, **however**, a significant number of Rhetoric/ Composition theorists (both ancient and modern) who have explored the realm of influences in writing which are **not limited** to conventional rationality (appositive) (such as inspiration, (and) intuition, (and) emotion, (and) etc.), often in the context of "creativity." **As a counterpoint to** the predominating rationalist approaches, this paper examines a number of these "**supra**-rational" (**beyond** the rational) works, in an effort to identify key common elements, (and) beliefs, (and) assumptions, (and) etc., and to consider ways to successfully implement these insights in the Composition class. (Cofer iii)

M10 uses 6 contrastive structures and 10 connection structures to distinguish the old way from the new, the rational way from the "supra-rational." M10's use of contrastives builds a paragraph with just as many complex ideas as do those who use a predominance of connective structures, but the use of contrastives has a tendency to build bi-polarities. This bi-polar tendency can be seen in M3's abstract.

> A comparison of Baconian criticism **argues** that Brian Vicker's stylistic analysis **renders out** important qualities in Bacon's prose which Stanley Fish's reader-response method can**not**. (Minard iii)

M3 sets Vicker's analysis against Fish's in order to compare them, but more importantly, to contrast them

in order to find one of them better or of superior quality in some regard: "Vicker's method demonstrates that Bacon's prose can be visionary and dialectical, **contrary** to Fish's thesis" (Minard iii).

The strategy of defining by contrast is common to these male writers. M6 writes: "**Juxtaposing** passages of Don DeLillo's prose **against** like passages from his contemporaries reveals DeLillo's distinct stylistic presence. . .(Sisk iii). M7 writes: "**regardless** of the method of response used, response should be **primarily** to content" (Sonnenburg iii) which implies that response to content is different from and superior to other responses. M8 writes about Winston Churchill's oratory style: "He **stands out. . ,few** published studies exist examining this man's ability. . .and those are **superficial**" (Stark iii) in which the implication is that Churchill is not connected with most others, that he and M8's critique of his oratory style are not superficial but are distinct and unique. M9 writes: "college writers [sic] experience is **not** necessarily the result of **a failure** of our nation's secondary school system; **rather** I wish **to argue** that they are the result of **certain conflicts**" (Wood iii). M9 here **argues** or sets himself against others, sees himself as disconnected from others regarding this issue; he sees college writers' inability to be part of

the better group who can write well not as a **failure** of the nation's secondary school system but as something else apart from that and sees the real problem as the result of **certain conflicts** instead of students having levels of competence which might connect them with other writers at the same skill level. M12 writes: **"Certain aspects. . .**were determined **to be problematic** and in need of **revision.** This writer believed that the faculty might **abandon** the program . . ." (West iii).

Each of these statements, which are consistent with the balance of the men writers' sample, reveals a "certain correspondence between the rhetorical, syntactical, grammatical patterns and the writer's way of looking at the world" (Thale 286). These men writers tend to define by contrasting and by using contrastive structures to express their method of thinking, their method of seeing the world and how people and objects interrelate.

> And when there is a high degree of regularity in the use of these patterns we may guess that the pattern comes from, and therefore reveals something of, the writer's habitual way of seeing reality, and that the pattern is one of the ways in which a similar way of looking at the world is created for the reader. (Thale 286)

Thus, we can see that Flynn's conclusion that "we ought not to assume that men and women use language in identical ways or represent the world in a similar fashion" (431) is justified. These men do define the world and

their relationship to it most often by use of contrastive structures, and these women most often do define their world and their relationship to it by means of connective structures even though they use the same basic language, English, and the same basic grammatical structures in about the same number of words, sentences and paragraphs to do so. There is a stylistic difference between women's and men's academic prose.

CHAPTER FOUR: Concluding Thoughts

In the Educated Imagination, Northrup Frye discusses three different "levels of the mind": the level of consciousness and awareness of self; the level of social participation or our identity which comes from relating with others; and the level of imagination which Frye sees as the means of producing literature. "There are not really different languages, of course, but three different reasons for using words" (Frye 23). It is not that we speak or write in different languages, but we have different reasons for using language. We use the same type of words, the same type of sentence structures, and the same type of paragraphing. But we have different purposes for writing, and along with different purposes, there comes different uses of language.

This difference in use of language has become evident in this thesis. As Flynn suggested in her essay, we should not be surprised if women and men use language differently. A "characteristic pattern" (431) has emerged in this analysis: women writers have a strong tendency to define by connection; men writers have a strong tendency to define by contrasting. The men in this study tend to separate and disconnect while the women tend to synthesize and combine. "Males and females use language . . .[and] writing strategies and patterns of representation"

differently (Flynn 431). Men tend to find it easier to write about information and objects by contrasting and separating them, finding a status level to attach to them to and putting them in that status-oriented compartment. Women find it easier to write about information and objects by connecting them, seeing how they are interrelated and synthesizing them. Thus men tend to disconnect when they speak, contrast when they write, command when they lead while women tend to connect when they speak, synthesize when they write, support when they lead.

Each is a valid method of looking at the world, a valid method of using language, of analyzing, associating, synthesizing and producing academic discourse. Each should be encouraged, taught and valued. But they are not currently equally valued. Although synthesis in academic prose is not negated, it is not seen on the same plane as argumentation, which is taught as the higher mode of discourse. Centuries of study have been devoted to variations on the theme of argumentation. Rhetoricians, classical and modern, consistently have worked for the strongest and most effective way to argue. Classes in critical thinking are taught based on the idea that argumentation is the primary mode of academic discourse while synthesis sits off in a corner as a silent junior partner. As long as we have a status-oriented hierarchy

of prose modes, we privilege contrast over connection, and thus the very nature of academic prose works against women and women's way of seeing reality and women's way of writing.

If women's and men's different ways of seeing and writing are to be valued equally, a clearer understanding of what the male and female models of academic prose look like is needed. We need a clearer picture of the different ways men and women use language. Because expectations for prose were not developed predominant by or for women writers, and women have written in this climate, women have adopted this system and styles expected of them in order to succeed. So it is hard to know what a female model of academic prose is or might be if fully realized independently of these forces. But we can listen to people who have been working on this question.

Patricia Sullivan suggests that women can and have "cross-dressed" or cross-voiced. Indeed, Laura Cereta's accolades in the 15th century were not due to her writing as a woman, but due to her ability to cross-voice, her ability to take on the perspective, the knowledge, the tone of Bibulus Sempronius. But when she spoke as a woman and used her acquired skills to connect herself with other women and to confront Bibulus Sempronius as one who would "admire [her] as a female prodigy," he challenged

her belief in the ability of women. She found his behavior "low and vulgar" and saw it as an attempt "to halt Medusa with honey" (495). She could have ignored a personal attack, even been "silent," but she could not tolerate an attack on her "entire sex" (496). Herein was the problem for Bibulus, that women could have their own voices, their own messages, their own perspectives, and their own uses of language. Just as Laura Cereta spoke out and just as Sarah Grimke spoke out and as Adrienne Rich and Helene Cixous and many others have spoken out, more women will continue to speak out. Women may tire of cross-voicing, of editing themselves out of their academic prose, of hearing "don't use the authorial 'I'", "speak from the third person or the voice of the academic community," "be objective," "argue."

And at the same time, women are asking what might a feminine model of academic prose look like? What are the implications for academic prose if women's perspective on life, if women's style, if women's ways of thinking and writing are inculcated into the expectations for academic discourse? First, women should be encouraged to speak though their own perspectives, and acknowledge their contexts in the world and use them to develop contexts for their questions and their answers. For example, if a woman writer is speaking to the criminal

justice community on the topic of rape and she or her sister has been raped, for her to separate herself from her rage is dishonest to her as a writer and dishonest to us as readers. Her perspective, her story, is part of the evidence that she integrates into her text. To attempt to be objective--to separate herself from the human or emotional or personal aspects of the topic--is often not only dishonest, it is undesirable for it does not permit the fuller revelation of a personal and knowledgeable perspective on her present understanding of the truth. By honestly and honorably conveying what she understands of the truth, her authorial "I" becomes authoritative.

Second, women connect the cognitive and the affective (Lamb 11), thinking and feeling, logos with pathos with ethos, much as the Sophists and Aristotle did. Women tend to make connections among their emotional processes, their ethical processes, and their cognitive processes as they organize, synthesize, and express ideas. It is all part of making connections for women.

Third, beyond women's personal approach to academic discourse, women are collaborative: multivoiced. Because women make connections readily, collaboration could be an essential component of learning and expression for women whether with other persons or with other texts.

Because most women may tend to rely on their ability to make connections with others and with texts, they may see a consensus of many voices and varied perspectives as strength.

Women's personal perspective and collaborative efforts may indeed produce a different text, perhaps one as different as Sarah Grimke hoped for early in the 19th century. Ruth Ellen Boetcher Joeres, writing an editorial for Signs, says "the way" we express our ideas is "fundamentally" important and we must speak "individually" as well as "collectively" (701, 703).

Fourth, as Joeres suggests, feminist prose promotes accessibility. Exclusionary jargon may separate reader from text and ideas (702). While feminist prose requires particularity, it also requires the kind of clarity which invites reader to participate with the ideas in the text. It invites connection with the reader and text.

Most women may not tend to set up contrasts, to divide and argue; as this study indicates, they may tend to connect and synthesize. Both styles should be reflected in the way we teach academic discourse. Synthesis should be used as fully as is argumentation, not as an occasional extra tool but as a primary means of creating academic prose alongside argumentation. The current system of teaching writing throughout academia is a reflection of

the primary emphasis on argumentation. Argumentation is how the world has been seen, how the world has been patterned. It has been assumed that others--including women--also view the world argumentatively. This should be reconsidered.

Women writers should be given the opportunity to learn according to their own styles of thinking and their own ways of using language also. It's time, as Rich tells us, to take women seriously, to give women an equal footing with the men in academia: yes, we should require critical thinking; yes, we should require argumentation; but we should also require collaboration; we should also require synthesis. We should make sure the doors are open for women writers and for all writers to make connections as a primary means of academic reasoning.

In order to facilitate this process we must do more research, more empirical academic research. First this study must be empirically confirmed. Next, it should be applied to other student writers at other academic levels. And we must look at how people deal with differences. Also we must examine more ways to help women out of their "silence" (Rich 176).

Although the female voice and the female model in academia is just taking form, the female academic voice of women writers does exist, alongside the male academic

voice. Often women have had to adopt the male voice to fit in, to survive, to perform in an academic system based on the male model. Until the female model is well established, women will still have to do both, to meet the requirements of male academia and find their voices as women.

Perhaps it would be good to remember that language use is a matter of choices as Cereta tells us and a matter of varied purposes as Frye tells us. This study offers evidence of more than one style, more than one way of seeing the world, more than one model of language use available to writers of academic prose. This study has shown that there is a difference. It is time we paid attention to that difference.

WORKS CITED

Bakhtin, Mikhail. From "Marxism and the Philosophy of Language." The Rhetorical Tradition. Ed. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. 924-944.

Barinaga, Marcia. "Is There a 'Female Style' in Science?" Science 16 April 1993. 384-391.

Brown, Penelope. "Women and Politeness: A New Perspective on Language and Society." Reviews in Anthropology, May/June (1976): 240-249.

Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Carrocci, Noreen. "Clarifying Gender Differences or Communication Effectiveness: Which is Our Aim?" Proceedings of the 2nd and 3rd Conferences on Communication, Language, and Gender. Madison: University of Wisconsin--Extension, 1982. 329-337.

Cereta, Laura. "Letter to Bibulus Sempronius, Defense of the Liberal Instruction of Women." The Rhetorical Tradition. Ed. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. 495-498.

Chodorow, Nancy. The Reproduction of Mothering. Berkeley: University of CA Press, 1978.

Cixous, Helene. "The Laugh of the Medusa." The Rhetorical Tradition. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. 1232-1245.

Coates, Jennifer and Deborah Cameron. Women in Their Speech Communities. London: Longman, 1988.

Coates, Jennifer. Women, Men and Language. London: Longman, 1993 Ed.

-----Women, Men and Language. London: Longman, 1986 ed.

Eman, Virginia and Benjamin W. Morse. "The Construct of Androgeny: An Overview and Implications for Research." Communication, Language and Sex. Ed. Cynthia L. Berryman and Virginia Eman. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1980. 76-90.

Fairclough, Norman. Language and Power. London: Longman, 1989. 46.

Flynn, Elizabeth. "Composing as a Woman" College, Composition and Communication. 39, Dec 1988. 423-435.

-----Staffroom Interchange:"Composing 'Composing as a Woman': A Perspective on Research." College, Composition and Communication. 41, Feb. 1990. 83-89.

Freire, Paulo. Pedogogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury Press, 1968.

Frye, Northrup. The Educated Imagination. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1964. 13-33.

Gilligan, Carol. In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Grimke, Sarah. "Letters on the Equality of the Sexes and the Condition of Woman." The Rhetorical Tradition. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. 685-696.

Joeres, Ruth Ellen Boetcher. "Editorial." Signs 7, 701-703.

Lakoff, Robin. "You Are What You Say?" Language Awareness. Ed. Paul Eschholz, Alfred Rosa and Virginia Clark. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986 Ed. 311-318.

Lamb, Catherine. "Beyond Argument in Feminist Composition." College Communication and Composition 42, Feb. 1991. 11-24.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally. "Intonation in a Man's World." Signs 3, (1978): 541-559.

Nichols, Patricia C. "Women and Their Speech Communities." Women and Language in Literature and Society. Ed. Sally McConnell-Ginet, Ruth Borker, and Nelly Furman. New York: Praeger, 1980. 140-149.

Nilsen, Alleen Pace. "Sexism in English: A Feminist View." Language Awareness. Ed. Paul Eschholz, Alfred Rosa and Virginia Clark. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986. 301-310.

Pollitt, Katha. "Are Women Morally Superior to Men?" The Nation. 28 Dec. 1992. 799-807.

Rich, Adrienne. "Taking Women Students Seriously." The Norton Reader, Shorter Eighth Edition. New York: W.W. Norton, 1992. 169-176.

Rosener, Judy. "Ways Women Lead." Harvard Business Review. Nov./Dec. 1990.

-----"Debate: Ways Men and Women Lead." Harvard Business Review Jan.-Feb. 1991. 150-153.

Sachs, Jacqueline. "Preschool Boys' and Girls' Language Use in Pretend Play." Language, Gender, and Sex in Comparative Perspective. Ed. Susan U. Philips, Susan Steele, and Christine Tanz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Smith, Charles Kay. Styles and Structures. New York: W.W. Norton, 1974. 242.

Sullivan, Patricia A. "Feminism and Methodology in Composition Studies." Method and Methodology in Composition Research. Ed. Gesa Kirsch and Patricia A. Sullivan. Carbondale, Ill.: So. University Press, 1992. 37-60.

Tannen, Deborah. You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation. New York: Morrow, 1990.

Thale, Jerome. "Style and Anti-Style: History and Anti-History." College English 29 Jan 68. 286-302.

Thorne, Barrie, Cheris Kramarea and Nancy Henley. Language, Gender and Society. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury, 1983.